

DART Survey of JUDGES: Summary of Responses on Key Issues

DART Survey: JUDGES	Back-ground	Operation issues			Reliability (past 5 years)					Accuracy (past 5 years)					Other		
	1.a	1.c	2.b	2.c	3.a	3.b	3.c	3.d	3.e	4.a	4.b	4.d	4.e	5.c	5.d	5.e	
Respondent #				Play back: RATE how easy 4=Very easy 1=Very hard	# of equip-ment failures	# of soft-ware failures	# of human failures	# times had to re-conduct hrngs	RATE reliability: 4=Excellent 1=Terrible	# complaints RE: incomplete recordings	RATE recording, clarity & completeness: 4=Excellent 1=Terrible	# of problems with transcripts	RATE transcript accuracy: 4=Excellent 1=Terrible	Do benefits outweigh problems?	Cases types that require a cert. ct reporter?	Would you recommend DART used in your ct?	
City	Yrs as Judge	Total sup-port staff	Problems with DART ctroom policies?														
1 Rochester, MN	11	3	No	3	Few	Few	Few	0	4	0	4	0	4	Yes	None	Yes	
2 Lincoln, NE	22	5	No	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	4	Yes	None	Yes	
3 Minnea-polis, MN	13	3	No	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	4	Yes	None	Yes	
4 Salt Lake City	9		Yes	N/A	many	many	4 to 5	0	2	Yes	2	Some	3	Yes	1st deg murder	No	
5 Willmar, MN	12	1.5	No	N/A	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	4	Yes	Hrg impaired person	Yes	
6 Willmar, MN	23	2.5	No	N/A	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	4	Yes	Hrg impaired person	Yes	
7 Willmar, MN	9	1.5	No	4	0	0	0	0	4	Yes	4	0	4	Yes	None	Yes	
8 Willmar, MN	26	3	No	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	4	Yes	Hrg impaired person	Yes	
9 Minnea-polis, MN	24	2	No	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	

* Written comments are available in a separate document.

DART Survey of ATTORNEYS: Summary of Responses on Key Issues

DART Survey: ATTORNEYS		Operation			Reliability (past 5 years)			Accuracy (past 5 years)						Other	
		1.a	2.b	2.c	3.a	3.b	3.c	3.d	4.a	4.b	4.c	4.e	4.f	5.c	5.d
Respondent #	City	Yrs as Atty	Problems with DART courtroom policies?	Play back: RATE how easy 4=Very easy 1=Very difficult	# of equipment or software failures	# of human failures	# times had to re-conduct hearings	RATE reliability: 4=Excellent 1=Terrible	Complaints RE: incomplete recordings [No/Yes]	# times you listened to a DART recording from this ctthouse?	RATE clarity & completeness of recordings: 4=Excellent 1=Terrible	Problems with transcripts	RATE transcript accuracy: 4=Excellent 1=Terrible	Do benefits outweigh problems?	Cases types that should require a cert. ct reporter?
1	Rochester, MN	22	No	4	0	0	0	4	No	2	4	No	4	Yes	None
2	Lincoln, NE	15	No	3	0	1	0	4	No	2	4	Yes	4	Yes	None
3	Lincoln, NE	24	No	Don't know	0	1	0	4	No	4	4	No	4	Yes	None
4	Salt Lake Cty	17	No	3	0	2	0	4	Yes		3	Yes	3	Yes	Yes
5	Salt Lake Cty	40	No	3	0	1	0	3	Yes	10-25/yr	3	No	3	Yes	None
6	Salt Lake Cty	33	Yes	2	1	2	0	4	Yes	15	3	Yes	3	Yes	Yes
7	Salt Lake Cty	22	No	Don't know	3	3	0	4	No	20-30	4	No	4	Yes	Yes
9	Minneapolis	4	No	Don't know	0	0	0	4	Yes	0		No	4	Yes	
8	Salt Lake Cty (sent written comments only)														

* Written comments are available in a separate document.

DART Survey of COURT REPORTERS and RECORDING MONITORS: Summary of Responses on Key Issues

DART Survey: Ct REPORTERS & RECORDING Monitors*		Background		Accuracy of Recordings (past 5 yrs)					Reliability (past 5 yrs)				Other		
		1.a	1.b	2.a	2.b	2.c	3.d	3.e	4.a	4.b	4.c	4.d	5.c	5.d	5.e
Respondent #	City	# Yrs worked in courts	# Yrs worked in this court	# times listened to DART recordings	Any inaudible parts of recordings?	RATE clarity & completeness of recordings: 4=Excellent 1=Terrible	Problems with transcripts [No/Yes]	RATE transcript accuracy: 4=Excellent 1=Terrible	# of equipment or software failures	# of human failures	# times had to re- conduct hearings	RATE reliability: 4=Excellent 1=Terrible	Do benefits outweigh problems?	Cases types that require a cert. ct reporter?	Would you recommend DART used in your ct? [No/Yes]
1	Lincoln, NE	25.5	25.5	Daily	Yes	4	Yes	4	1	1	0	4	Yes	Hearing impaired person	Yes
2	Rochester, MN	156	15	Daily	Yes	4	No	4	0	1	0	4	Yes	Hearing impaired person	Yes - with comments
3	Salt Lake City	23	23	Several	No	4					0	3			
4	Salt Lake City						No	4	0	0	0	4	Yes	1st deg. Felonies	
5	Salt Lake City	5	5		Yes	3	Don't know	N/A	0	0	0	3	Yes	Capital murder	
6	Sanford, FL**	18	8.5	1000+	Yes	4	No	4	0	1	0	4	Yes	High transcript volume ct rms.	Yes - with comments
7	Willmar, MN	20	20	Daily / Weekly	No	4	No	4	0	0	0	4		None	Yes - with comments
8	Willmar, MN	9	9	Many	No	4	No	4	0	0	0	4	Yes	None	Yes - with comments
9	Willmar, MN	15	15	Daily	Yes	4	Yes	4	0	2	0	4	Yes	None	
10	Willmar, MN	14	14	Daily / Weekly	Yes	4	Yes	4	2		Yes	4	Yes		
11	Minneapolis	16	16	Daily	Yes	4	No	4	0	0	0	4	Yes	Hearing impaired person	Yes

* Written comments are available in a separate document.

** A court reporter in MN emailed the survey to a friend who has several years experience with DART in her court in FL.